



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION N	0.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/038,004 01/02/2002		01/02/2002	Daniel R. Baum	Shutterfly 04C001	8059	
31688	7590	08/10/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	ASSOCIA		GARG, YOGESH C			
	ADOW VIS E, CA 951			ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JUS	E, CA 95	133		3625		

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_
Advisory Action	10/038,004	BAUM, DANIEL R.	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yogesh C Garg	3625	
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 12 July 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a vinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application a timely filed amendment whicl	ition. A proper reply to a places the application in	i
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A 	- ·	in the final rejection, whichever is la	ator In
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.136(a).	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extending set in the final Office action	ension en; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying	the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.	
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendme	ent
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		dered but does NOT place th	ie
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-21</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8.☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by t	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer			
0.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>	/	7600	

Yogesh C. Garg Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3625 Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments are not persuasive. The applicant argues that the refrence Lockhardt teaches uploading of images but points away from the element of receiving a single card order specifying a plurality of recipients and that single card order is completed in a single transaction sequence. The applicant is attacking the reference Lockhardt individually. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642. The same reasoning applies in not accepting the applicant's arguments against other references Shiota, Johnson, and Hartman. It is to be noted that these arguments were also presented in the Final Office action, pages 2-7, mailed on June 14, 2004.

Continuation of 10. Other: The Terminal Disclaimer received on July 12, 2004 is not acceptable because improper language was used and the person who signed the T.D. is not a recognized officer of the assignee (see Form Paragraphs 14.29 and possibly 14.29.02). Please encourage person resubmitting the TD to either use the forms from the MPEP Section 1490 or the language from the form re "pending second application.".